

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 16 2007

REMARKS**1. Summary of Office Action**

In the Office Action mailed November 29, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 14, 15, 16, 18-24, 26, 30, 31, 33, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,141,545 (Begeja et al.). The Examiner also rejected claims 5, 7, 27, and 29 as being allegedly unpatentable over Begeja in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,795,707 B2 (Martin et al.). In addition, the Examiner objected to claims 8-13, 17, 25, 28, and 32, but stated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections.

In a telephone conference with the undersigned on January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2007 the Examiner clarified that there were no § 112 rejections and that claims 8-13, 17, 25, 28, and 32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. The Examiner also affirmed his handwritten notes on the Office action, which indicated that claim 8 was objected to, rather than rejected.

**2. Response to Claim Objection and Claim Rejections**

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-5. Therefore, the rejection of those claims is now moot.

In response to the Examiner's objection of claim 8, Applicant has amended independent claim 6 to include all of the limitations of claim 8 and intervening claim 7, and Applicant has cancelled claims 7 and 8. (Applicant has also amended claim 9 to depend from claim 6 instead of from now-cancelled claim 7.) As a result, claim 6 now recites the subject matter of claim 6 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable. Claim 6 is thus now in condition for allowance.

Claims 9-22 all depend ultimately from claim 6 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 6 is allowable.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 10, Applicant has added new claim 35, which sets forth in independent form the invention that was recited in claim 10 (including the subject matter of original claim 6, from which claim 10 depended). Since claim 35 recites the subject matter of claim 10 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, claim 35 is now in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant has added new claim 36 that depends from claim 35 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 35 is allowable.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 12, Applicant has added new claim 37, which sets forth in independent form the invention that was recited in claim 12 (including the subject matter of original claim 6, from which claim 12 depended). Since claim 37 recites the subject matter of claim 10 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, claim 37 is now in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant has added new claim 38 that depends from claim 37 and is thus allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 37 is allowable.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 17, Applicant has added new claim 39, which sets forth in independent form the invention that was recited in claim 17 (including the subject matter of original claims 6 and 15, from which claim 17 depended). Since claim 39 recites the subject matter of claim 17 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, claim 39 is now in condition for allowance.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 25, Applicant has added new claim 40, which sets forth in independent form the invention that was recited in claim 25 (including the subject matter of original claim 23, from which claim 25 depended). Since claim 40 recites the subject matter of claim 25 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, claim 40 is now in condition for allowance.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 28, Applicant has amended independent claim 23 to include all of the limitations of claim 28 and intervening claim 27, and Applicant has cancelled claims 27 and 28. (Applicant has also amended claim 29 to depend from claim 23 instead of from now-cancelled claim 27.) As a result, claim 23 now recites the subject matter of claim 28 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable. Claim 23 is thus now in condition for allowance.

Claims 24-26 and 29-34 all depend ultimately from claim 23 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 23 is allowable.

In response to the Examiner's objection to claim 32, Applicant has added new claim 41, which sets forth in independent form the invention that was recited in claim 32 (including the subject matter of original claim 23, from which claim 32 depended). Since claim 41 recites the subject matter of claim 32 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, claim 41 is now in condition for allowance.

By making the amendments noted above, Applicant does not acquiesce in the claim rejections. However, Applicant has made the claim amendments without prejudice in order to expedite prosecution.

Now pending in this application are claims 6, 9-26, and 29-41, of which claims 6, 23, and 35, 37, and 39-41 are independent and the remainder are dependent. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and thus Applicant respectfully requests notice to that effect.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any aspect of this application, the Examiner is welcome to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2141.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: January 16, 2007

By: 

Lawrence H. Aaronson  
Reg. No. 35,818